

**Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry Merit Increase Procedures for
Tenure Track Faculty and Non-tenure Track Faculty
(updated May 20, 2014)**

Preamble: The following paragraphs document the evaluation criteria and procedures for all faculty (i.e., tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty, including career, adjunct, and postdoc) within the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. This policy explicitly establishes the following:

1. All faculty will be evaluated for merit as it is not permitted to opt out.
2. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
3. The evaluation for merit includes review of both recent performance review(s) and the current CV.
4. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations must receive some merit increase. Specifically, these are individuals ranked in tiers 3-5 for research TTF and tiers 2-3 for research NTTF and instructional TTF/NTTF.

Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved. Documentation of merit decisions will be maintained by the Department Head and the Department's Director of Administration to allow for appropriate follow up or review if questions arise later.

Evaluation criteria and procedures vary for each class of faculty within the Department and are outlined in the following sections:

A. Tenure Track Faculty

The Department Head of Chemistry & Biochemistry will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the research Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) during the relevant evaluation period. All research TTF are reviewed annually by the Department's Personnel & Advisory Committee using a comprehensive evaluation form developed by the Department in the late 1980s. Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: research, teaching and service with a weighting of 10:7:3. When one takes into account that much of the research effort overlaps with the teaching effort because of the faculty/student interactions in the laboratory, teaching and research have somewhat equal weight. The Personnel & Advisory Committee evaluate each other, but these evaluations are only disclosed to the Department Head.

The Personnel & Advisory Committee will meet with the Department Head to discuss their ratings and is available to work with the Department Head in determining merit increases. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the TTF member has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

When requested, the Department Head will provide the department's merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit awards will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

The following categories are used to rank research tenure track faculty:

- 5 – Outstanding: exceeds expectations in all areas
- 4 – Excellent: exceeds expectations in at least one area, meets expectations in other areas
- 3 – Good: meets expectations in all areas
- 2 – Fair: does not meet expectations in at least one area
- 1 – Poor: does not meet expectations in more than one area

Summary of Criteria for Research TTF Performance Evaluation

I. Teaching:

- (1) The overall quality of teaching of classroom instruction including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation.
- (2) Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance.
- (3) Supervision and evaluation of student research at both the undergraduate and graduate level including student review committees.
- (4) Revision of courses to keep them updated.
- (5) Development and implementation of effective teaching techniques.
- (6) Development of educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluation materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

II. Research and Scholarly Activities:

- (1) Publications of significance and quality.
- (2) Research in progress and substantially planned work.
- (3) External funding of research program.
- (4) Participation and attendance at conferences, seminars and professional meetings.
- (5) Holding offices in professional societies or serving on professional committees, editorial boards and science advisory boards.
- (6) Awareness of current developments in the faculty member's profession.
- (7) Recognized evidence of scholarliness such as special awards, lectureships and scholarly citations.
- (8) Education of research personnel and execution of responsibilities associated with supervising research theses and projects of undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral associates.

III. Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service

- (1) Departmental/Institute administration and curriculum, personnel and policy committees or activities.
- (2) College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees or activities.
- (3) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national and international governmental bodies etc) as they are related to teaching or research.

B. Tenure Track and Non-tenure Track Faculty – Officers of Instruction

The Department Head of Chemistry & Biochemistry will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the instructional Tenure Track Faculty (TTF-OI) and Non-tenure Track Faculty (NTTF-OI, both career and adjunct) during the relevant evaluation period. All instructional TTF/NTTF-OI are reviewed annually by the Department's Personnel & Advisory Committee using a comprehensive evaluation form developed by the instructional faculty in winter 2014. Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: teaching and instructional support, scholarly and creative activity and service (e.g., professional, university and community). The weighting scheme will be adjusted based on the duties and responsibilities described in an individual's contract language and his/her current job description. While evaluated on a different scale than the research faculty, there remains a strong component desired from the instructional faculty to be involved in scholarly and creative activities that assist in improvement of the educational program in the Department, contribute to the chemical education community and to be engaged in professional organizations associated with the chemical enterprise. The Personnel & Advisory Committee evaluate each other, but these evaluations are only disclosed to the Department Head.

The Personnel & Advisory Committee will meet with the Department Head to discuss their ratings and is available to work with the Department Head in determining merit increases. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the TTF/NTTF-OI member has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

When requested, the Department Head will provide the department's merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit awards will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

The following categories are used to rank instructional faculty:

- 3 – exceeds expectations
- 2 – meets expectations
- 1 – does not meet expectations

Summary of Criteria for Instructional TTF/NTTF-OI Performance Evaluation

I. Teaching and instructional support

Mastery of the Discipline: Faculty are expected to use course materials of appropriate rigor, quality, breadth and depth, and to demonstrate currency in their teaching activities. Materials submitted by a faculty member as evidence of mastery of the discipline in teaching shall include instructional materials, such as lecture notes, quizzes, exams, assignments and may include student evaluations, etc. The committee also considers classroom observation by peers in the same discipline and video recording of classroom performance as evidence for evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Innovation/Scholarship of Teaching and Instructional Support: Faculty are expected to demonstrate innovation and scholarship in their teaching, such as new course development,

instructional, pedagogical and technological developments, team teaching, and the ability to adapt to the needs of our diverse student population in the classrooms. Evidence of innovations/scholarship of teaching might include instructional materials, CD/DVDs, web links etc., record of innovations, letter(s) from team teaching partner(s), grants for teaching support or educational materials development, and/or teaching publications/poster.

Student Interaction: Faculty are expected to make efforts to interact with their students in the classroom, during office hours, and in instructional contexts outside of the classroom. Interactions shall include mentoring, advising, and being responsive to student needs.

II. Scholarly and Creative Activity

Presentations and Professional Visibility: Faculty members are expected to actively pursue professional visibility through publications, presentations and participation in professional conferences, as well as publications and presentations at professional conferences/meetings by students working with the faculty member. The most significant activity would be as an invited speaker at a national or international symposium or conference. Seminars presented at academic, private and industrial institutions by invitation will also be deemed evidence of professional achievement and growth.

Grants and Contracts: Tenured instructors are encouraged to demonstrate a sincere, realistic, and continuing effort to obtain funding for their research and curriculum development activities. The faculty member shall clearly address his or her role in collaborative grants or contracts in which there are multiple participants. Other sources of funding such as intramural grants, private contracts, etc. are considered evidence of professional achievement and growth.

III. Service

Service to the Profession: Faculty members are expected to participate in professional activities that further the goals of their profession and its organizations. Evidence of professional service shall include, but are not limited to, attendance, participation in and/or leadership in meetings of relevant professional organizations, and service as a reviewer for professional publications and/or extramural granting agencies (papers, textbooks, grants).

Service to the University: Faculty members are expected to engage in service that furthers the goals of the department, college, and university. Evidence of university service shall include, but are not limited to: attendance, active participation and/or leadership in departmental meetings; participation in department, college and/or university committee activities; attendance and appropriate engagement in academic advising and/or mentoring.

Service to the Community: Faculty members are encouraged to participate in service activities that contribute to the life and culture of the communities comprising the university's regional service area as well as beyond at the state, national, or global level. Evidence of community service shall include, but are not limited to: outreach to local schools and community colleges; presentations of lectures to community groups or organizations; and service as an active member of community organizations.

C. Non-tenure Track Faculty – Officers of Research

The Department Head of Chemistry & Biochemistry will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty-Officers of Research (NTTF-OR, which include career, adjunct or postdoc) during the relevant evaluation period. All NTTF-OR will be reviewed annually by their immediate faculty supervisor (in most cases not the Department Head) using the “Professional Development Planning and Performance Review” form developed by the UO Office of Research, Innovation and Graduate Education. This review will evaluate the performance of duties, tasks, and responsibilities described in the contract language and job descriptions for each position.

The faculty supervisor will discuss with the Department Head his/her ratings and propose a merit raise. The Department Head’s merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the NTTF-OR member has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance review.

When requested, the Department Head will provide the department’s merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit awards will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

The following categories are used to rank research non-tenure track faculty:

- 3 – exceeds expectations
- 2 – meets expectations
- 1 – does not meet expectations

Summary of Criteria for Instructional NTTF-OR Performance Evaluation

These can vary markedly from person to person depending upon the duties, tasks, and responsibilities described in the contract language and job descriptions for each position. The exact criteria will be listed in the “Professional Development Planning and Performance Review” form developed by the UO Office of Research, Innovation and Graduate Education.